1		HONORABLE RONALD B. LEIGHTON
2		
3		
4		
5		
6	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT	
7	WESTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON AT TACOMA	
8	NATHANIEL ISH,	CASE NO. C12-6084 RBL-JRC
9	Petitioner,	ORDER AFFIRMING ORDER
10	v.	DENYING REQUEST FOR EVIDENTIARY HEARING
11 12	JEFFREY A UTTECHT,	
13	Respondent.	
14	THIS MATTER is before the Court on Petitioner Ish's Objection/Motion for	
15	Reconsideration [Dkt. #39] of the Magistrate Judge's Order [Dkt. #38] denying his request for an	
16	evidentiary hearing on his claim that his <i>Miranda</i> waiver was not valid because he was impaired	
17	by drugs and alcohol. The Petitioner's Objection is before this Court under Rule 72(a). In order	
18	to overrule the underlying Order, this Court must determine that it was clearly erroneous or	
19	contrary to law. See also 28 U.S.C. §636(b)(1)(A)	
20	The Magistrate Judge determined that Petitioner had not sought to supplement the record	
21	in the state court on this issue, and that its review of the issue under 28 U.S.C. §2254(d)(1) was	
22	limited to record that was in fact before the state court. Cullen v Pinholster, 131 Sct. 1388, 1398	
23	(2011).	
24		

1 Ish argues that the Magistrate Judge's Order first says that he did attempt to modify the 2 record, and then says he did not. This Court does not read the Order in that way. Ish did not 3 attempt to modify or supplement the state court record until after his Motion for discretionary review to the Washington Supreme Court was denied. As the Magistrate Judge's Order explains, 5 where the factual record is not supplemented in state court, this Court's ability to conduct an evidentiary hearing is quite limited. See 28 U.S.C. §5542(e)(2). This Court agrees that none of 6 7 the enumerated exceptions applies, and that this Court's review is limited to the record that was before the State Court. 8 9 The Denial of the Motion for an evidentiary hearing was not clearly erroneous and it is not contrary to law. The Petitioner's Objection is OVERRULED and the Order is AFFIRMED. 10 11 AN Order resolving the underlying §2254 Petition will follow. 12 IT IS SO ORDERED. Dated this 13th day of January, 2014. 13 14 15 RONALD B. LEIGHTON UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE 16 17 18 19

20

21

22

23

24